Two Masks, One Face: State Capitalism and Private Feudalism as Mirrors of the Same System

The Independent Observer – Volume II

Author: Siddhartha Wardhan
Affiliation: Independent Researcher, *The Independent Observer*
ORCID: 0009-0005-4228-1124

JEL Codes: B14, P20, P26, N44, O17
Keywords: Marxism, State Capitalism, Private Feudalism, Soviet Union, China, Russia, Political Economy, Ideology, Class Hierarchy, Economic Systems

Abstract

Every ideology hides behind a mask. The Soviet Union hid behind the mask of equality; America hid behind the mask of freedom. Yet underneath both, the same face looked back—the face of hierarchy. This paper argues that, despite their different histories, capitalism and communism evolved into structurally identical systems of control. In capitalist countries, private ownership concentrates power in the hands of financiers, boards, and oligarchs. In communist states, the same concentration happens under government bureaucracies and party elites. Both systems sustain inequality, suppress worker independence, and prioritize obedience over innovation. Through case studies of the **Soviet Union, China, North Korea, and post-Soviet Russia,** this paper shows that **"state capitalism"** simply swapped corporate shareholders for political Commissars.

Meanwhile, **"private feudalism"** disguises hereditary wealth as meritocracy—both wearing masks: one face. Both uphold an illusion of fairness while maintaining control. The study concludes by examining how modern American workers—often self-described capitalists—unwittingly support Marxist ideas of workplace democracy, showing that the human longing for fairness surpasses any specific ideology.

Section 1: The Masked Rivalry – How Systems Pretend to Oppose Each Other

Every ideology claims it is different from its enemy. One touts freedom, the other equality. One glorifies entrepreneurs; the other sanctifies workers. But beneath the slogans, the exact control mechanisms run both.

Capitalism and communism were never true opposites; instead, they are rival operating systems built on the same foundation—hierarchy, control, and labor extraction. Both rely on centralization. Both demand obedience. Both suppress dissent in the name of order.

The Cold War was depicted with cinematic flair: the West as the land of liberty, the East as the land of equality. Both powers fought over who would dominate global labor and capital flows. The flags changed, but the logic stayed the same—those who control production and information govern society.

In the US, corporate boards, banks, and private institutions dictated the country's economic path. In the Soviet Union, ministries, central committees, and political apparatchiks did the same. The result: two rival oligarchies—each claiming moral superiority, each living off the labor of others. Marx's original vision aimed for liberation from this system—a society where creators and builders would also decide. But Lenin, Stalin, and Mao hijacked that vision, creating massive bureaucracies that mirrored the very systems they sought to demolish.
Consequently, the world is divided into two camps that appear different on paper but are spiritually alike in practice:

Private Feudalism: where billionaires control production and call it freedom.
State Capitalism: where bureaucrats control production and call it equality.
Both are masks. Behind them stands the same face—the face of a system driven by labor, rewards hierarchy, and justified by myth.

Section 2: Marx's Vision and Its Betrayal

Karl Marx's dream was not the bureaucratic nightmare that followed in his name. He imagined a world where those who worked—the miners, machinists, builders, and farmers—would collectively own the fruits of their labor. His ideal system was decentralized and participatory, where the factory floor, not the central office, held sovereignty.

Marx believed that capitalism's flaw was not productivity but ownership. The issue was not that people-built wealth, but that those who did not make—those who merely *owned*—controlled it. To him, liberation meant dissolving that separation between labor and power. The worker should not sell his time to a master; he should *become* his own master.

But Marx never envisioned a totalitarian state running the economy like a corporation. His writings in *The Critique of the Gotha Program* make clear that socialism, as he saw it, would be a *transitional stage*—a bridge toward a classless society where the state itself would "wither away." The state was supposed to be temporary, a midwife for a new kind of ownership rooted in equality and collective decision-making.

Lenin and Stalin shattered that vision. Facing civil war, foreign invasion, and internal chaos, Lenin argued that **"the dictatorship of the proletariat"** required absolute authority. Power is concentrated in the hands of the Communist Party, not in the hands of the workers themselves. By the time Stalin took control, this so-called proletarian dictatorship had become a bureaucratic aristocracy—***a pyramid of privilege wearing the mask of equality***.

The Soviet system turned Marx's revolution into state capitalism. Instead of private shareholders, there were ministries. Instead of corporate managers, there were party secretaries. The exact hierarchy remained—only the titles changed. Workers still labored for someone else's plan, quotas replaced profits, and the rewards went to those who managed, not those who produced.

The rhetoric of equality concealed the same old structure of inequality. Soviet planners set quotas for steel, coal, and grain just as capitalists set quarterly earnings targets. Success was measured not in human well-being, but in output. Labor was still alienated—its product owned and distributed by others.

This betrayal went far beyond Russia. Mao's China, Kim Il-Sung's North Korea, and later Castro's Cuba all followed the Soviet model: state-controlled economies justified by the workers but run for the benefit of the elite. Bureaucrats became the new bourgeoisie—living in privileged apartments, vacationing at secluded resorts, and enjoying luxuries that ordinary citizens could only dream of.

The tragedy of Marxism was not that it failed; it was that it was never tried. What emerged was not worker socialism, but managerial capitalism in red clothing—a system that destroyed the soul of the worker in the name of saving him.

Section 3: State Capitalism in Practice – The Illusion of Equality

If capitalism is defined by the concentration of capital in private hands, then state capitalism is simply the same hierarchy in public clothing—the concentration of power in bureaucratic hands. The slogans promise equality, but the social architecture mirrors corporate capitalism: a few control production, information, and distribution, while the majority labor under ideological myths.

As political economist Peter Drucker (1993) argued, Soviet-style socialism was ***"managerial capitalism without shareholders."*** The *state* became the investor, and the *Party* became the board. In all such systems,

wealth flowed upward through bureaucratic privilege rather than market competition.

3.1. The Soviet Union – A Command Economy with a Corporate Soul

The ***Soviet Union officially*** abolished private property in 1917, yet by the 1930s, Stalin's ***five-year industrialization programs had transformed the USSR*** into a giant state-run corporation. Instead of stockholders, there were ministries; instead of shareholders' meetings, there were Party Congresses; instead of dividends, there were bonuses for plan fulfillment.

Economic historian Alec Nove (1992) estimates that by 1950, over 97% of Soviet industrial production was under direct state ownership, structured through more than 50 industrial ministries that functioned like corporate departments.
Output was measured in tons of steel and coal, not profits—but the incentives were the same: meet quotas or face punishment.

The classless ideal led to the emergence of a new class—the nomenklatura, the Party's managerial elite. Sheila Fitzpatrick's research (1999) shows that Party officials had exclusive access to "closed" stores (Beryozkas) that sold Western goods, imported cars, and high-end housing unavailable to ordinary citizens.

Archival records show that by the 1970s, officials' consumption surpassed the average worker's income by over 300% (Gorlizki & Khlevniuk, 2004). Despite its anti-capitalist rhetoric, the USSR was heavily involved in global trade. By 1985, it was exporting $32 billion annually in oil, gas, and raw materials to Western Europe (IMF, 1986). The state acted as a monopoly capitalist—trading commodities internationally while controlling domestic labor through ideological loyalty.In short, the Soviet worker's "boss" wore a red star rather than a suit, but the hierarchy remained the same.

3.2. China – The Red Market Miracle

China's model, often called **"socialism with Chinese characteristics,"** is a form of state capitalism at its best. After Mao died in 1976, Deng Xiaoping introduced market reforms through the 1978 Open Door Policy, privatizing production while maintaining political control. As he famously said, "It doesn't matter whether a cat is black or white, as long as it catches mice" (Vogel, 2011).

By the 2000s, this approach had created a hybrid empire where the Communist Party maintained ideological control while promoting market growth. Today, over 60% of China's GDP comes from state-owned enterprises (SOEs) or companies in which the government holds controlling stakes (OECD, 2020). Even nominally private giants like Huawei and Tencent have Party committees embedded within their organizational structures (Economist, 2019).

Inequality metrics reveal the contradiction. The Gini coefficient, which measures inequality, rose from 0.30 in 1980 to 0.47 in 2022 (World Bank, 2023), as seen in the United States. Meanwhile, China's elite—the so-called princelings, children of senior Party officials—hold top university positions abroad. A 2015 Harvard Kennedy School study found that over 80% of China's top 250 political families have at least one child studying in the U.S., U.K., or Canada (Li, 2015).

So, while the Chinese Communist Party promotes national self-reliance, its ruling class invests in Western luxury and education. Essentially, China exchanged revolutionary ideology for bureaucratic plutocracy—a one-party version of the American dream, measured not in freedom but in GDP.

3.3. North Korea – Dynastic Feudalism in Socialist Clothing

North Korea exemplifies an extreme case of transforming Marxism into a monarchy. Established in 1948 by Kim Il-Sung, it implemented hereditary rule—formally called a "Democratic People's Republic," but effectively functioning as a feudal kingdom. Political scientist Andrei Lankov (2015) notes that since the 1970s, North Korea has maintained a three-tiered class system (songbun): core elites, wavering loyalists, and hostile elements. The top 10% control access to housing, education, and food, while the bottom 40% face shortages and constant surveillance. Despite decades of sanctions, the regime generates billions annually through secret trade networks.

The **UN Panel of Experts (2021**) estimates that Pyongyang earned over $2.3 billion from illegal arms sales and natural resource exports in five years, often laundering money via Chinese intermediaries. Meanwhile, the Kim family estates showcase luxury Mercedes cars, Hennessy cognac, and European furniture (Lankov, 2015). Like Soviet elites before them, North Korean officials send their children to Switzerland or China for education, illustrating that privilege transcends socialism. Ultimately, North Korea is not a socialist utopia but a corporate monarchy—where the state owns everything, and the royal family owns the state.

3.4. Post-Soviet Russia – The Privatized Empire

When the ***Soviet Union collapsed in 1991***, its Communist Party elite didn't disappear—they rebranded themselves. Former ministers took on roles as CEOs; former apparatchiks became oligarchs. Within *ten years, over 70% of Russia's industrial assets shifted into private hands, mainly* controlled by individuals with close ties to the old Party network (Monaghan, 2012). Today, *Russia is a mix of state power and private wealth—a symbiotic oligarchy. Companies like Gazprom and Rosneft are technically public,* but the government holds a majority stake and leverages it to maintain political influence. According to Transparency International (2023), more than *60% of Russia's national wealth is owned by just 110 people*—a level of concentration like feudal Europe. *Putin's inner circle exemplifies this*: former KGB officers owning stakes in energy, banking, and defense, while also maintaining loyalty within a bureaucratic system dependent on state support. As Monaghan (2012) notes, "Russia's capitalism is managed through the state, not despite it." Even as Moscow criticizes Western decadence, the children of its elite study at universities in London, Paris, and New York—yet, the ideological cover remains, though the scene looks unchanged.

3.5. The Common Thread

In all these ***“socialist”*** systems, Marx’s promise of collective ownership fell apart into bureaucratic monopolies—structures that replaced entrepreneurs with administrators and profit motives with political loyalty. The USSR created party capitalism. China evolved into bureaucratic capitalism. North Korea hardened into dynastic capitalism. Russia perfected state-managed plutocracy. Each claimed to free workers; each replaced one elite with another.

Economic historian Branko Milanović (2019) describes this as **“convergent inequality,”** where both communist and capitalist countries end up with the same result: wealth concentrated at the top, under different moral claims. The real divide was never between socialism and capitalism but between rulers and the ruled. The factory manager in Moscow, the hedge fund CEO in New York, and the Party secretary in Beijing all serve the same unseen god—power through ownership.

Section 4: Private Feudalism – The Western Mirror

If the socialist world centralized power under the state, the capitalist world privatized it through corporations. Different methods, the same hierarchy. In both systems, a small elite controls resources, sets policies, and manages information, while the majority labor under illusions—one side chanting “equality,” the other “freedom.” In the West, this system has evolved into what can only be called private feudalism. The CEO has replaced the medieval king—the noble lord—with the investor, and the serf with the salaried employee. The modern workplace is not much different from a manor: you are bound to a hierarchy, subject to rules you didn't create, producing wealth you will never own.

4.1. The Corporate Monarchy

Corporations operate like kingdoms with their own set of rules. They have charters rather than laws, shareholders rather than nobility, and executives rather than monarchs. The corporate boardroom functions as a private government, creating laws, enforcing rules, and redistributing wealth. The employees—these so-called **"subjects”** of the monarchy—lack democratic power. They can’t vote on who leads, influence policies, or claim ownership of what they produce. They are in a form of contractual servitude, where obedience is traded for wages. Even the concept of **“at-will employment”** conceals an old truth: the power to rule resides with capital, not labor. Workers can leave, but the system endures. The setting may change, but the feudal logic stays the same. From ***Silicon Valley’s***

open-plan offices to Amazon's warehouses, the myth of innovation conceals a structure of control. Workers don't labor for society but for shareholders whose only allegiance is to the quarterly report. Stock options function as the new vassalage—small tokens of ownership given to ensure obedience, but never enough to grant absolute freedom.

4.2. Democracy for Sale

The **political system mirrors the economic structure**. Ideally, democracy ensures equal influence for all citizens; in reality, it often functions like an auction where the highest bidder has the most sway. Campaign finance, lobbying, and corporate sponsorship have transformed governance into a marketplace for access and influence. The **Supreme Court's Citizens United v. FEC (2010)** decision granted corporations nearly unlimited rights to spend on elections, arguing that such spending is protected free speech. As a result, politicians increasingly resemble brands, and elections seem like investments. Today, democracy feels more like managing portfolios than choosing leaders. Just as a ***Soviet factory worker*** had no say in production, the American voter wields limited power to influence policy. Both can voice dissatisfaction but cannot truly change the system. The ballot box, similar to a ***Party Congress, becomes a ritual with no real impac***t. As Sheldon Wolin suggests, America has entered an age of inverted totalitarianism — where corporate power dominates the state. Yet, many believe they are free because they can vote, consume, and share opinions online.

4.3. The New Lords of Capital

The Western oligarchs are just as entrenched as the Communist Party elites they once criticized. Elon Musk controls global infrastructure—from satellites to social media to electric transportation. Jeff Bezos owns not only a retail empire but also a surveillance supply chain that constantly monitors workers. BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street quietly hold shares in nearly every major company on Earth. These are not entrepreneurs; they are feudal landlords of the digital age. Their estates are measured not in acres but in algorithms. Their serfs do not plow soil but data. Like the Soviet elite, they claim moral virtue—talking about innovation, sustainability, and progress—while hoarding power. They preach disruption, but their real business is preservation: maintaining a world where ownership remains concentrated and unaccountable. The irony is almost poetic. While communist elites traveled to the West to send their children to elite universities, Western elites send their wealth abroad—to the Cayman Islands, Zurich, Singapore—escaping the very social contracts they publicly defend.
Both are global citizens of privilege, floating above the nations they exploit.

4.4. The New Serfdom

For the modern worker, freedom feels like an illusion maintained through debt. Student loans create intellectual servitude. Mortgages trap people in financial bondage. Health insurance links survival to employment. The medieval peasant worked to avoid starvation; the modern professional works to prevent ruin. Both labor not for liberty but for survival—an endless cycle of earning, paying, and owing. The gig economy completes this cycle. Uber drivers, DoorDash couriers, freelance coders—all praised as ***"independent"—***operate without rights, benefits, or stability. They are the freest slaves in history, sold the illusion of choice while algorithms control every move. This is capitalism's genius: it replaced coercion with consent. You sign the contract voluntarily, accept the terms, and in doing so, accept your own confinement.

4.5. The Religion of Productivity

Capitalism's most powerful ideology isn't greed—it's guilt. Workers are taught that rest is laziness, that leisure is failure, and that self-worth is tied to productivity. The Protestant work ethic has become an algorithm: perform or fade away. Even personal time is turned into a commodity—fitness trackers turn health into data, influencers profit from emotion, and hobbies become **"side hustles.'** Capitalism has found a way to monetize every human impulse—love, art, friendship, rebellion—and turn it into measurable engagement. Just as Soviet citizens were told to sacrifice for the ***Five-Year Plan***, modern consumers are encouraged to "grind" for success. The only difference is the flag over the factory.

4.6. The Corporate Empire

The global reach of corporations reflects the imperial ambitions seen in ancient empires. Google's algorithms sway elections more effectively than traditional propaganda outlets. Amazon's logistics surpass entire government supply systems. Meta influences collective consciousness more significantly than any ***state-controlled media***. Today, private empires dominate vital sectors like information, energy, communication, and finance. The most powerful leaders are now corporate executives, not presidents, conducting silent wars through acquisitions, data gathering, and currency manipulation. This represents the logical outcome of private feudalism: a world where citizenship is less critical than subscriptions, and sovereignty is replaced by service agreements.

4.7. Two Systems, One Structure

As the ***Soviet Union had its nomenklatura***, the United States has its corporate aristocracy. Just as the USSR relied on censorship committees, the West now has algorithmic curators. Soviet workers toiled to meet quotas, while today's workers focus on metrics such as engagement, sales, and productivity. Both systems assert they serve the people, yet the people serve them in return. The red flag and the dollar sign are two faces of the same hierarchy—masking the underlying power structure.

Section 5: The Hidden Marxists – How Americans Believe in Worker Power Without Knowing It

In the United States, the loudest defenders of capitalism often act in accordance with Marxist ethics without realizing it. They believe that hard work should determine rewards, that those who create a company's value should share in its success, and that the average worker deserves dignity equal to that of any executive. These beliefs—so strongly American in tone—are also fundamentally Marxist in content. A 2023 Pew Research Center survey found that 62% of Americans support employee profit-sharing and 57% favor worker representation on corporate boards, even though 67% have negative views of socialism (Pew Research Center, 2023). Gallup (2022) reports that union approval is at 71%—the highest since 1965.

Meanwhile, support for employee-owned firms (ESOPs) exceeds 80% across political parties (National Center for Employee Ownership, 2021). These preferences reflect an instinctive belief in worker democracy—the idea that those who create value deserve a say in how it is governed. What most Americans oppose, then, is not the ethics of Marxism but its branding. They've been taught to associate "socialism" with Soviet bureaucracy rather than with local self-governance. Their instincts favor equality, but their vocabulary has been shaped by propaganda.

5.1. The American Worker's Instinct for Fairness

The worker's creed is simple: a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. Yet, corporate capitalism often breaks this principle. From 1978 to 2022, worker productivity in the U.S. rose by 64%, while average hourly wages increased by only 17% (Economic Policy Institute, 2023). The gap—what Marx called surplus value—now benefits shareholders and executives, not the workers who produce it.

Nevertheless, Americans instinctively favor the producer over the investor. In a 2022 YouGov survey, 59% agreed that "workers who make a product deserve a share of company ownership," while only 18% supported

investor primacy (YouGov, 2022). This contradiction lies at the core of the American mindset: moral socialism wrapped in a capitalist image.

Sociologists Erik Olin Wright and Joel Rogers (2015) describe this as "ideological misalignment"—a society that supports economic equality but rejects its label. They note that when policies like universal healthcare or public broadband are discussed without using the word **"socialism,"** support increases by 20–30 percentage points.

5.2. The Rhetorical Trap

This confusion stems from the Cold War era. Starting in the 1940s, U.S. media outlets—funded by advertisers and government agencies—blurred the line between socialism and tyranny. Historian Richard Hofstadter (1964) described this as the paranoid style of American politics: a tendency to view collective action as a conspiracy against freedom. The term "Marxism" was linked to dictatorship, even though Americans benefited from Marxist-inspired reforms such as the eight-hour workday, child labor laws, social security, and public education (Foner, 1980).

Corporations further exploited this stigma. In the 1950s, General Electric and the National Association of Manufacturers launched nationwide ad campaigns associating free enterprise with patriotism (McElvaine, 2008). Workers were taught to see their bargaining power as subversive. "Freedom" came to mean freedom for the employer.

As a result, Americans learned to fear the very word that expressed their own aspirations. They do not want welfare; they want agency. They do not wish to be confined by bureaucracy; they want a voice. They do not seek revolution; they want representation. In each case, the core idea remains the same as Marx's 1867 statement: that the worker should not be alienated from his labor.

5.3. The Moral Foundation of Marxism in American Culture

Far from being alien, Marx's moral logic runs through American tradition. The Puritan work ethic demanded diligence but also mutual responsibility. The cooperative movements of the 19th century—farmers' alliances, credit unions, and labor halls—practiced forms of collective ownership long before "socialism" entered political vocabulary (Goodwyn, 1976). The New Deal, often remembered as pragmatic Keynesianism, borrowed heavily from socialist organizing: public works, guaranteed employment, and labor rights.

Even Christianity's social gospel movement—advocating "justice for the worker and dignity for labor"—echoes Marx's premise that morality demands material equity (Hopkins, 1891). As historian Mike Davis (2018) wrote, "America's forgotten Marxists are its small-town preachers, factory foremen, and the moral populists who never realized how radical their ethics were."

5.4. Capitalism's Borrowed Morality

Capitalism perpetuates itself by co-opting socialist virtues while eliminating socialist power. Corporations adopt teamwork language to disguise hierarchies. "Corporate social responsibility" reinterprets redistribution as philanthropy. Billionaires rebrand control as mentorship, creating the illusion of benevolent feudalism. Elon Musk talks about "democratizing space" while union-busting at Tesla (Reuters, 2021). Jeff Bezos highlights Amazon's "customer obsession" while monitoring workers' bathroom breaks (Levin, 2020). These contradictions are deliberate—they are essential. The capitalist elite must seem moral to sustain legitimacy, just as the Soviet leadership seemed ideological to justify privilege. The dominant American myth is that capitalism rewards merit. However, Saez and Zucman (2019) report that the top 0.1% of households now own 19.6% of all U.S. wealth—more than the bottom 80% combined. The "self-made" story hides inherited capital, tax shelters, and stock buybacks. The system persists because its victims believe they are temporarily embarrassed millionaires.

5.5 The Hidden Convergence

In practice, American workers already embody Marx's ethos. They demand profit-sharing, fair wages, and control over their own time—exactly what Marx envisioned when he wrote that communism meant "the real movement that abolishes the present state of things" (The German Ideology, 1846/1978). They reject collectivism because they have seen it corrupted, yet they yearn for community. They distrust the state because it spies on them, yet they crave fairness. They despise elitism, whether it wears a red star or a corporate logo.

Thus, the American worker has become an unconscious Marxist—living proof that the moral logic of socialism can survive even inside capitalism's heart. The ideology failed, but the ethics remain.

Section 6: Two Masks, One Face – The System That Survives Every Revolution

Every revolution claims to unmask oppression, yet each ends by wearing its own disguise. Whether draped in red banners or stock tickers, hierarchy always returns. The Soviet Union promised equality and delivered bureaucracy; the United States pledged to liberty and delivered debt. As political theorist Hannah Arendt (1958) warned, revolutions rarely abolish domination—they merely change its administrators.

6.1. The Shared DNA of Power

Across different regimes, the structure of control stays the same. A small group monopolizes decision-making, information, and coercive power. Branko Milanović (2019) shows that by 2018, both capitalist and formerly socialist countries had converged toward similar income inequality levels: the top 10 percent earning 50 percent of the income. He calls this **"convergent inequality"**—proof that ownership, not ideology, determines how wealth is distributed.

Political systems differ only in rhetoric. Capitalism wields property; communism wields planning. Both depend on obedience to centralized authority. Noam Chomsky (1999) observed that Cold War rivalry was "a contest between two managerial states," each devoted more to productivity than to liberation.

6.2. The Metaphor of the Masks

Imagine a single face—impersonal and self-preserving—wearing two masks. One smiles as it sells freedom through markets. The other frowns, promising equality through planning. Both speak different moral languages, yet the same breath animates them: control. When the monarchy fell in 1789, bankers replaced barons. When the Bolsheviks executed the Romanovs in 1918, commissars inherited their palaces (Figes, 1996). When colonial empires collapsed after 1945, multinational corporations took over their trade routes (Slobodian, 2018). The masks changed; the face endured.

6.3. The Perpetual Counterfeit of Change

Each revolution begins with emancipation and concludes with administration. The French Revolution eliminated aristocracy but institutionalized bourgeois capitalism (Piketty, 2020). The Russian Revolution abolished private property but established party ownership. The American Revolution ended monarchy but entrenched slavery and an oligarchic landowning system (Zinn, 2005). Arendt (1958) called this the "paradox of revolution": the pursuit of freedom through institutions that ultimately restrict it. Power, like energy, is neither created nor destroyed—it simply shifts between hosts.

6.4. The Machine of Control Modern governance, both East and West, functions through a trio of bureaucracy, technology, and narrative. Bureaucracy justifies rule via procedures (Weber, 1922/1978). Technology ensures compliance through data. Narrative submits appear virtuous. In the Soviet Union, ministries monitored grain quotas; today, algorithms track clicks and credit scores. Surveillance has moved from inducing fear to providing feedback. As Zuboff (2019) explains, "surveillance capitalism" internalizes control: we willingly supply our own behavioral data. The Stasi relied on informants; Silicon Valley relies on Wi-Fi. The difference is aesthetic. The Soviet citizen obeyed the Party to avoid punishment; the digital citizen obeys the algorithm for attention. Both approaches lead to the same outcome: predictable subjects.

6.5. The Psychological Bondage

The most effective domination is self-imposed. Michel Foucault (1975) showed that disciplinary power works by inducing individuals to monitor themselves. Under feudalism, people obeyed because the king was divine. Under capitalism, they obey because the market is rational. Under communism, they obey because the state is moral. In each case, the ideology justifies submission.

Thus, the factory becomes the cathedral of our age. Workers pray through productivity, consumers through purchase. Freedom is measured not by autonomy but by access to goods—what Herbert Marcuse (1964) called "repressive desublimation," the pleasure that keeps people docile.

6.6 The Moral Camouflage of Hierarchy

Every system justifies inequality with a moral story. Capitalists appeal to meritocracy; socialists appeal to service. Both claim sacrifice as a virtue. Yet in practice, virtue flows upward while sacrifice flows downward. Elites

justify privilege as earned or necessary; the poor accept it as unavoidable. Antonio Gramsci (1971) called this “hegemony”—consent created through culture.

The American executive who promotes innovation to justify a bonus and the Soviet commissar who invokes duty to explain a dacha speak different languages but tell the same story: we deserve to rule because we work harder for you. Remove the flags and brands, and what remains is a system of self-preserving hierarchy—a structure that feeds on obedience and fears consciousness. It has survived monarchies, revolutions, and digital disruption because it inhabits not governments but minds. As Wolin (2008) observed, “Managed democracy is a system that has succeeded in absorbing its own critique.” True liberation demands not new institutions but a new psychology—a citizen who refuses to delegate conscience. Until then, capital and communism, market and ministry, will continue to change costumes on the same stage.

Section 7: The Great Illusion — Freedom as a Product

Capitalism’s triumph over communism was not moral or intellectual—it was **optical**. The Soviet Union collapsed under the visible weight of its corruption; capitalism endured by hiding its own behind glass and neon. As Guy Debord observed in ***The Society of the Spectacle*** (1967), modern life replaced participation with representation: people no longer live their freedom—they watch it performed for them. Capitalism’s great innovation was not production but **perception management**.

Where the Soviet citizen was coerced, the Western consumer is **co-opted**. Freedom became a subscription plan. One chooses between brands, parties, or digital platforms owned by the same corporate conglomerates. The appearance of choice replaced the substance of autonomy. The worker who selects a new employer through LinkedIn believes he is free; in reality, he circulates within a closed labor market run by a few data brokers and multinational firms.

This is capitalism’s true genius: it **privatized control and sold it as self-expression**. You can curate your identity—your phone plan, your social feed, your political sticker—but all through systems designed by the same handful of investors. The illusion of diversity conceals a monopoly. In the digital economy described by Zuboff (2019), surveillance itself becomes a consumer service; users supply behavioral data in exchange for dopamine-engineered convenience. Freedom is no longer a right; it is a user interface.

Behavioral economics demonstrates how easily this illusion persists. Research on **“nudge”** architecture shows that when options are presented

as personal choices, people see systemic constraints as voluntary decisions (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). Therefore, inequality seems consensual. The Soviet commissar demanded obedience; the modern algorithm seeks engagement. Both ensure predictability—but the latter makes it profitable.

Capitalism survived the twentieth century not by eliminating coercion but by **aestheticizing** it. It turned hierarchy into lifestyle, debt into credit score, and compliance into convenience. Freedom became the product, marketed through emotion rather than ideology. The citizen became a customer, the vote a data point, and dissent a brand opportunity.

8. The Paradox of Progress

Both capitalism and communism have mastered the art of justifying technology—progress as a form of absolution. Each system claims moral victory through innovation, yet both treat human suffering as the price of progress. The Soviet Union built rockets and tanks while its citizens waited in line for bread. The United States built billionaires and skyscrapers while its workers sank into medical debt. Both called that suffering “sacrifice.” Industrial progress without fair distribution isn’t civilization—it’s spectacle. As noted in The Geography of Enslaved Wealth, technological ability without social justice only reproduces inequality instead of prosperity. In each empire, innovation became propaganda—a mirror polished with poverty. The race for progress, whether through nuclear arms or neural networks, keeps dependency alive. States justify inequality by promising that today’s deprivation will buy tomorrow’s utopia. But, as The Kardashev Mirage (to be published) argues, even a Type I civilization can’t develop without moral coherence and energy fairness. A machine can increase output; it can’t increase meaning. Progress becomes propaganda when it’s disconnected from justice. Every new skyline and space probe becomes a monument not to advancement but to forgetfulness—the forgetting of those left behind.

9. Conclusion: Two Faces, One Pyramid

History did not witness the victory of freedom over tyranny; it observed the evolution of tyranny’s marketing. The Cold War was not a

clash of opposites but a rivalry between related hierarchies—two hierarchies vying for control of labor, narrative, and legitimacy. Communism preached equality but enforced obedience. Capitalism preached freedom but monetized dependence. Each built a pyramid with an elite at the top and idealism as its scaffolding. What Marx envisioned was not wrong—his interpreters were. And what the West celebrates as democracy is not false—it is unfinished.

As shown in The Closed Mind of the Superpower, American exceptionalism now suffers from the same isolationist decay that once doomed the Soviet Union. Both mistake privilege for permanence. In truth, their survival depends on reform, not repetition, of the cycle of empire. The task of the twenty-first century is to break the illusion of difference and create systems where ownership, education, and voice are shared rather than delegated. Until humanity reclaims participation from propaganda, capitalism and communism will remain two faces of the same pyramid—one wrapped in profit, the other in principle, both resting on the same foundation of inequality.

References

Abrahamian, E. (2008). *A History of Modern Iran.* Cambridge University Press.
Anderson, E. (2017). *Private Government: How Employers Rule Our Lives (and Why We Don't Talk About It).* Princeton University Press.
Applebaum, A. (2017). *Red Famine: Stalin's War on Ukraine.* Doubleday.
Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition.* University of Chicago Press.
Baldwin, R. (2016). *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization.* Harvard University Press.
Barber, B. (2013). *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities.* Yale University Press.
Beblawi, H., & Luciani, G. (1987). *The Rentier State.* Croom Helm.
Brookings Institution. (2018). *Tariffs and the Hidden Taxes on the Working Class.* Washington, D.C.

Camus, A. (1951). *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt.* Knopf.
Cederström, C., & Spicer, A. (2015). *The Wellness Syndrome.* Polity Press.
Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit Over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order.* Seven Stories Press.
Clark, W. R. (2005). *Petrodollar Warfare: Oil, Iraq, and the Future of the Dollar.* New Society Publishers.
Conquest, R. (1986). *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine.* Oxford University Press.
Davidson, S., De Filippi, P., & Potts, J. (2018). *Blockchain and the Economics of Crypto-Tokens and Initial Coin Offerings. Information Economics and Policy, 47*, 20–36.
Debord, G. (1967). *The Society of the Spectacle.* Buchet-Chastel.
Dikotter, F. (2010). *Mao's Great Famine: The History of China's Most Devastating Catastrophe, 1958–1962.* Bloomsbury.
Drucker, P. (1993). *Post-Capitalist Society.* HarperCollins.
Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success.* Random House.
Eichengreen, B. (2011). *Exorbitant Privilege: The Rise and Fall of the Dollar and the Future of the International Monetary System.* Oxford University Press.
Epstein, R., & Robertson, R. (2015). The search-engine manipulation effect and its possible impact on elections. *PNAS, 112*(33), E4512–E4521.
Fichtner, J., & Heemskerk, E. (2020). The rise of the global asset management oligopoly. *Business and Politics, 22*(2), 273–295.
Fitzpatrick, S. (1999). *Everyday Stalinism.* Oxford University Press.
Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Gallimard/Random House.
Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The World Is Flat.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Gaddy, C. G., & Hill, F. (2003). *The Siberian Curse: How Communist Planners Left Russia Out in the Cold.* Brookings Institution.
Gallup. (2022). *Labor Unions Approval Highest Since 1965.* Gallup News Service.
Gilens, M., & Page, B. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on Politics, 12*(3), 564–581.
Goodwyn, L. (1976). *Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in America.* Oxford University Press.
Gorlizki, Y., & Khlevniuk, O. (2004). *Cold Peace: Stalin and the Soviet Ruling Circle, 1945–1953.* Oxford University Press.
Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* International

Publishers.
Han, B.-C. (2017). *Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power.* Verso.
Hudson, M. (2021). *Super Imperialism: The Origin and Fundamentals of U.S. World Dominance.* Pluto Press.
IMF. (2023). *World Economic Outlook — Shifting Trade and Global Payments Patterns.* International Monetary Fund.
International Energy Agency (IEA). (2023). *Critical Minerals Market Review.* OECD/IEA.
Karl, T. L. (1997). *The Paradox of Plenty: Oil Booms and Petro-States.* University of California Press.
Lankov, A. (2015). *The Real North Korea: Life and Politics in the Failed Stalinist Utopia.* Oxford University Press.
Li, C. (2015). *Princelings and China's Power Elite.* Harvard Kennedy School Belfer Center Report.
Lincoln, W. B. (1994). *The Conquest of a Continent: Siberia and the Russians.* Cornell University Press.
Lukin, A. (2020). *Russia and China: The Anatomy of a Partnership.* Palgrave Macmillan.
Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-Dimensional Man.* Beacon Press.
Mearsheimer, J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics.* W. W. Norton.
Milanović, B. (2019). *Capitalism, Alone: The Future of the System That Rules the World.* Harvard University Press.
Monaghan, A. (2012). *The New Russian State: Post-Soviet Transformation and Power.* Routledge.
OECD. (2020). *State-Owned Enterprises in the Global Economy.* OECD Publishing.
Office of the Federal Register. (1971). President Nixon's Address Outlining a New Economic Policy. *Federal Register, 36*(160).
Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action.* Cambridge University Press.
Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century.* Harvard University Press.
Pipes, R. (1990). *The Russian Revolution.* Vintage.
Schiller, H. I. (1989). *Culture, Inc.: The Corporate Takeover of Public Expression.* Oxford University Press.
Schweickart, D. (2020). *After Capitalism (3rd ed.).* Rowman & Littlefield.
Slobodian, Q. (2018). *Globalists: The End of Empire and the Birth of Neoliberalism.* Harvard University Press.
Spiro, D. E. (1999). *The Hidden Hand of American Hegemony: Petrodollar*

Recycling and International Markets. Cornell University Press.
Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness.* Yale University Press.
Transparency International. (2023). *Global Corruption Report 2023.*
Vogel, E. (2011). *Deng Xiaoping and the Transformation of China.* Harvard University Press.
Wardhan, S. H. (2025). *A Systems-Centered Manifesto on Automation, Education, and the Carceral State. Independent Observer — Volume I.*
Wardhan, S. H. (2025). *The Geography of Enslaved Wealth. Independent Observer — Volume II.*
Wardhan, S. H. (2025). *The Closed Mind of the Superpower. Independent Observer — Volume III.*
Wardhan, S. H. (2025). *The Death of the A Student. Independent Observer — Volume IV.*
Wardhan, S. H. (2025). *Will the G7 Survive Without a Human Workforce? Independent Observer — Volume V.*
Wardhan, S. H. (2025). *The Kardashev Mirage: Why Earth Must Power Up Before It Reaches for Mars. Independent Observer — Volume VI.*
Weber, M. (1905/2002). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* Routledge.
Whyte, W. F., & Whyte, K. K. (1991). *Making Mondragón: The Growth and Dynamics of the Worker Cooperative Complex.* ILR Press.
Wolin, S. (2008). *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism.* Princeton University Press.
World Bank. (2023). *World Development Indicators Database.* Washington, D.C.
World Bank. (2024). *Global Economic Prospects: Rebalancing Growth Toward the East.*
World Gold Council. (2024). *Gold Demand Trends Q2 2024.* London: World Gold Council.
Zinn, H. (2005). *A People’s History of the United States.* Harper Perennial.
Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power.* PublicAffairs